



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/551,258	04/18/2000	Jeffrey M. Jahn	00 P 7577 US	1761

7590

05/08/2003

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
186 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

DAMIANO, ANNE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2184

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/551,258

Applicant(s)

JAHN ET AL.

Examiner

Anne L Damiano

Art Unit

2184

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10-16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 9 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8 and 18-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 April 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. Claims 10-16 are allowed.
2. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The primary reason for allowance of claims 10-16 is the inclusion of a fault solution analyzer unit coupled to an alarm notice generator unit arranged to generate a fault solution report based upon a fault analysis, in all 7 of the claims.

3. Claims 2-8 and 18-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2184

5. Claims 1 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Desnoyers et al. (5,968,189).

As in claims 1 and 17, Desnoyers discloses a method (which is interpreted as being stored in the form of a computer program product, implemented in computer code) for automatically reporting a detected network fault in a distributed communications network, comprising:

Detecting the network fault (column 8: lines 6-8);

Determining whether or not the detected network fault is a reportable network (critical) fault (column 8: lines 41-44);

Generating an alarm report based upon the reportable network fault (column 7: lines 63-67); and

Distributing the alarm report based upon a distribution list in real time (column 1: lines 59-67, column 7: lines 63-67, column 8: lines 6-17 and figure 7) (The reporting to one or more designated processing nodes of column 7: lines 64-65, indicates that some form of a distribution list must exist in order to designate such nodes. The current operation being interrupted upon detection of a critical error and error service packets being generated and transmitted of column 8: lines 11-17, exemplifies real-time generating and distributing of an alarm report.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2184

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desnoyers is applied to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 9, Desnoyers discloses the method of automatically reporting a detected network fault in a distributed communication network, above. However, Desnoyers does not specifically disclose a type of network.

It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method taught by Desnoyers for reporting network faults in a telephony over LAN network. It would have been obvious because Desnoyers teaches the need for efficiently reporting errors in communications networks (column 1: lines 46-55). A person skilled in the art would have understood that Desnoyers' method could be implemented in a telephony over LAN network to improve error reporting.

#### *Response to Arguments*

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Applicant's arguments, see Amendment, filed 2/20/03 with respect to claims 2-16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 2-16 has been withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2184

*Conclusion*

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne L Damiano whose telephone number is (703) 305-8010. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM-5:30PM, first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9731. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Anne L Damiano  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2184

ALD  
May 1, 2003

  
**SCOTT BADERMAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**